

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are rejected.

Claims 18-33 are allowed.

Claims 34-48 are withdrawn.

Claim 1 is amended.

New claim 49 is added.

No new matter is added.

Claims 1-33 and 49 remain pending.

Reconsideration of claims 1-17 is respectfully requested in light of the above amendment and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. The omitted elements are: the formation of specific elements of the LCD, particularly, the formation of the interlayer insulator layers of the LCD. The applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

With respect to claim 1, the claim recites the forming of both a photo-sensitive layer over a substrate and a photo-insensitive layer over the photo-sensitive layer. As disclosed on page 5, lines 5-7, of the present application a multi-layer interlayer insulator is comprised of the photo-sensitive layer and the photo-insensitive layer. Thus claim 1 is believed to be allowable as complete under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 2-17 depend from independent claim 1, and for at least the same reasons as claim 1, these claims are also believed to be allowable as complete under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 5, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sandhu (U.S. Patent No. 6,624,085) (“Sandhu”). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 1 is amended to recite, “exposing a portion of the photo-sensitive layer to a radiation source through the photo-insensitive layer via a photo-mask.” Support for the limitations can be found in, for example, FIG. 1C and the accompanying text of the present application.

Sandhu does not teach or disclose the above limitations of claim 1. In particular, Sandhu, at column 5, lines 7-38, discloses formation steps of etching an opening into the light blocking material 66 to uncover a portion of the lower photoresist 65 before the exposed portion of the photoresist 65 is irradiated. See FIGS. 7-9 of Sandhu. Thus, Sandhu does not teach or disclose, “exposing a portion of the photo-sensitive layer to a radiation source *through the photo-insensitive layer* via a photo-mask,” as recited in claim 1 of the present application. See FIG. 1C of the present application. Thus, amended independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Sandhu and the applicants respectfully request its allowance.

Claims 5 and 16 depend from amended independent claim 1, and for at least the same reasons, these claims are believed to be allowable over Sandhu and the applicants respectfully request their allowance.

With respect to new claim 49, the claim recites, “contacting the portion of the photo-sensitive layer using a developing solution wherein the developing solution reaches the underlying photosensitive layer through the photo-insensitive layer.” None of the cited references teach or disclose the above limitations of the present application for the reasons stated above. Thus, new claim 49 is allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 2-4 and 6-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandhu. The applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.


As discussed above, Sandhu fails to disclose the limitations “exposing a portion of the photo-sensitive layer to a radiation source through the photo-insensitive layer via a photo-mask,” as recited in claim 1. Claims 2-4 and 6-13 depend from amended independent claim 1. Thus, Sandhu fails to describe each and every element of these claims. Therefore, the rejection does not present a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Thus, claims 2-4 and 6-13 are believed to be allowable over Sandhu for their dependency and their own merits. The applicants respectfully request their allowance.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-33 and 49 of the application as amended is solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Hosoon Lee

Limited Recognition Under 37 CFR § 10.9(b)

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being deposited with the United States
Postal Service as first class mail in an
envelope addressed to: Commissioner for
Patents, Washington, DC 20231
Date: February 26, 2004



Ilka Dalton